

## 2-MODULAR MATRICES

JAMES OXLEY AND ZACH WALSH

ABSTRACT. An integer matrix  $A$  is  $\Delta$ -modular if the determinant of each  $\text{rank}(A) \times \text{rank}(A)$  submatrix has absolute value at most  $\Delta$ . The class of 1-modular, or unimodular, matrices is of fundamental significance in both integer programming theory and matroid theory. A 1957 result of Heller shows that the maximum number of nonzero, pairwise non-parallel rows of a rank- $r$  unimodular matrix is  $\binom{r+1}{2}$ . We prove that, for each sufficiently large integer  $r$ , the maximum number of nonzero, pairwise non-parallel rows of a rank- $r$  2-modular matrix is  $\binom{r+2}{2} - 2$ .

### 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is motivated by the theory of integer programming. Given a *constraint matrix*  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$  and vectors  $b \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , the fundamental problem of integer programming is to find an integer vector  $x$  in the polyhedron  $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : Ax \leq b\}$  that maximizes the inner product  $c^T x$ . In general, one cannot expect to solve an integer program efficiently, but better efficiency can be expected if  $A$  has fewer rows; see [5] for a more detailed discussion.

If the constraint matrix has special structure, then it may be possible to bound the number of rows as a function of the rank. Given a positive integer  $\Delta$ , an integer matrix  $A$  is  $\Delta$ -*modular* if the determinant of each  $\text{rank}(A) \times \text{rank}(A)$  submatrix of  $A$  has absolute value at most  $\Delta$ . A 1-modular matrix is called *unimodular*, and a result of Heller [6] shows that a rank- $r$  unimodular matrix has at most  $\binom{r+1}{2}$  nonzero, pairwise non-parallel rows. We prove the following result for  $\Delta = 2$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** *For each sufficiently large integer  $r$ , the maximum number of nonzero, pairwise non-parallel rows of a rank- $r$  2-modular matrix is  $\binom{r+2}{2} - 2$ .*

The previous best bound upper bound was  $\binom{r+1}{2} + C \cdot r$  for a large constant  $C$ , due to Geelen, Nelson, and Walsh [3]. The bound of Theorem 1.1 is tight, for example, for the matrices  $A_r$  and  $A'_r$  in Figure 1, where  $D_r$  is the  $r \times \binom{r}{2}$  matrix whose columns consist of all  $r$ -tuples with exactly two nonzero entries, the first equal to 1 and the second equal to  $-1$ .

---

*Date:* May 11, 2021.

*2010 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05B35, 90C10.

*Key words and phrases.* integer programming, unimodular matrix, representable matroid, excluded minor.

$$A_r = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} & \begin{array}{c} \hline 1 \quad \cdots \quad 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline I_r & D_r \begin{array}{c} I_{r-1} \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array} \right]$$

$$A'_r = \left[ \begin{array}{c|c} & \begin{array}{c} 1 \quad \cdots \quad 1 \\ 1 \quad \cdots \quad 1 \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \hline I_r & D_r \begin{array}{c} -I_{r-2} \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array} \right] \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{array}$$

FIGURE 1.  $A_r$  and  $A'_r$ .

We prove Theorem 1.1 using matroids. For each positive integer  $\Delta$ , let  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$  denote the class of matroids with a representation over  $\mathbb{R}$  as a  $\Delta$ -modular matrix. We say that such a matroid is  $\Delta$ -*modular*. An integer matrix  $A$  is *totally  $\Delta$ -modular* if the determinant of every submatrix of  $A$  has absolute value at most  $\Delta$ . We define  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_\Delta$  to be the class of matroids with a representation over  $\mathbb{R}$  as a totally  $\Delta$ -modular matrix. Clearly  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{M}_\Delta$  for each  $\Delta \geq 1$ , because every totally  $\Delta$ -modular matrix is also  $\Delta$ -modular. Since every unimodular matrix is row-equivalent to a totally unimodular matrix, the classes  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_1$  are in fact equal.

The class  $\mathcal{M}_1$  is the class of *regular matroids*. Tutte [10] proved that this class coincides with the class of matroids representable over every field, and that there are exactly three minor-minimal matroids not in  $\mathcal{M}_1$ . For  $\Delta \geq 2$ , the class  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$  is not very well-studied. It is proved in [3] that  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$  is minor-closed, and that every matroid in  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$  is representable over every field with characteristic greater than  $\Delta$ . In particular, every matroid in  $\mathcal{M}_2$  is representable over  $\text{GF}(3)$  and  $\text{GF}(5)$ ; such a matroid is called *dyadic*.

In view of Tutte's results and the fundamental significance of unimodular matrices, there are several natural open questions concerning  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ .

**Problem 1.2.** *Let  $\Delta$  be a positive integer.*

- (i) *What is the maximum size of a simple rank- $r$  matroid in  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ , and which matroids attain this maximum?*
- (ii) *What are the minor-minimal matroids that are not in  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ ?*
- (iii) *Is  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$  closed under duality?*
- (iv) *Is  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_\Delta$  equal to  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ ?*

Theorem 1.1 shows that the maximum size of a simple rank- $r$  2-modular matroid is  $\binom{r+2}{2} - 2$ , if  $r$  is sufficiently large, and the vector matroids of  $A_r$  and  $A'_r$  show that there are at least two matroids that attain this maximum. In order to prove Theorem 1.1, we show that (iii) and (iv) have affirmative answers for  $\Delta = 2$ , and we find several excluded minors for  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , including  $U_{2,5}$ ,  $F_7$ ,  $U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}$ , and  $\text{AG}(2,3) \setminus e$ . In fact, we prove the following result,

which is stronger than Theorem 1.1. A line in a matroid is *long* if it contains at least three *points*, that is, rank-one flats. The matroid  $R_9$  is the ternary Reid geometry [7, p. 654], which is the simple rank-3 matroid consisting of long lines  $L_1, L_2, L_3$  with a common intersection point  $x$  so that  $|L_1| = |L_2| = 4$ ,  $|L_3| = 3$ , and both elements in  $L_3 - \{x\}$  are on four long lines.

**Theorem 1.3.** *For each sufficiently large integer  $r$ , the maximum size of a simple rank- $r$  matroid with no minor in  $\{U_{2,5}, F_7, U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}, R_9\}$  is  $\binom{r+2}{2} - 2$ .*

While we make progress on Problem 1.2 for  $\Delta = 2$ , it is surprisingly difficult for  $\Delta \geq 3$ . For  $\Delta \geq 3$ , the current best upper bound on the maximum size of a simple rank- $r$  matroid in  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$  is  $\binom{r+1}{2} + C \cdot r$  for a large constant  $C$ , proved by Geelen, Nelson, and Walsh [3]. However, it is unclear what the correct bound should be. It is also unclear whether  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$  is closed under duality for  $\Delta \geq 3$ , and even what the rank-2 excluded minor is for  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ . Some of the difficulties of these open problems are discussed in Section 4. After introducing some preliminaries in Section 2, we show in Section 3 that  $A_r$  and  $A'_r$  attain equality in Theorem 1.1. The proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 are given in Section 9. A crucial case in the proof of the latter, when  $M$  has a spanning-clique restriction, is treated in Section 8. Prior to that, Sections 5, 6, and 7 consider 1-, 2-, and  $k$ -element extensions of a clique.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

We follow the notation of [7], unless otherwise stated. For a matroid  $M$ , we write  $|M|$  and  $\varepsilon(M)$  for, respectively,  $|E(M)|$  and the number of points of  $M$ . For an integer  $\ell \geq 2$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{U}(\ell)$  the class of matroids with no  $U_{2,\ell+2}$ -minor.

We first describe a construction that shows how the vector matroids of  $A_r$  and  $A'_r$  are related to  $M(K_{r+2})$ . If a matroid  $M$  is obtained from a matroid  $N$  by deleting a non-empty subset  $T$  of  $E(N)$ , then  $N$  is an *extension* of  $M$ . If  $|T| = 1$ , then  $N$  is a *single-element extension* of  $M$ , and if  $|T| = k$  for  $k \geq 2$ , then  $N$  is a  *$k$ -element extension* of  $M$ . Every single-element extension of a matroid  $M$  corresponds to a *modular cut* of  $M$ , which is a set  $\mathcal{F}$  of flats with the following two properties:

- (i) If  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $F'$  is a flat of  $M$  containing  $F$ , then  $F' \in \mathcal{F}$ .
- (ii) If  $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $r_M(F_1) + r_M(F_2) = r_M(F_1 \cup F_2) + r_M(F_1 \cap F_2)$ , then  $F_1 \cap F_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ .

A pair of flats that satisfies (ii) is a *modular pair*. A modular cut  $\mathcal{F}$  is *proper* if it does not contain all flats of  $M$ . The modular cut of  $M$  corresponding to a single-element extension  $N$  of  $M$  by an element  $e$  is the set of flats of  $M$  that span  $e$  in  $N$ . Conversely, Crapo [1] showed that, for every modular cut  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $M$ , there is a unique single-element extension  $N$  of  $M$  by an element  $e$  for which  $\mathcal{F}$  is precisely the set of flats of  $M$  that span  $e$  in  $N$  (see [7, Theorem 7.2.3]). Given a set  $\mathcal{F}$  of flats of  $M$ , the modular cut of  $M$  *generated* by  $\mathcal{F}$  is the intersection of all modular cuts of  $M$  that contain every flat in  $\mathcal{F}$ . If

$N$  is a single-element extension of  $M$  by an element  $e$  corresponding to the modular cut generated by a single flat  $F$ , then we say that  $e$  has been *freely added* to  $F$ .

A matroid  $M'$  is an *elementary projection* or an *elementary quotient* of  $M$  if there is a single-element extension  $N$  of  $M$  by an element  $e$  so that  $M' = N/e$ . Thus, every elementary projection of  $M$  corresponds to a modular cut of  $M$ . We prove in the following section that the vector matroids of the matrices  $A_r$  and  $A'_r$  are both simplifications of elementary projections of  $M(K_{r+2})$ .

Two classes of matroids arise in the proof of Theorem 1.3: spikes and Reid geometries. A *spike* is a simple matroid  $S$  with an element  $t$  so that the simplification of  $S/t$  is a circuit, and each parallel class of  $S/t$  has size two. The element  $t$  is a *tip* of  $S$ . A spike  $S$  may have several elements that can serve as a tip. For example, the Fano plane is a spike, and every element can serve as a tip. However, a spike of rank at least four has a unique tip.

A *Reid geometry* is a simple rank-3 matroid  $N$  consisting of long lines  $L_1, L_2, L_3$  with a common intersection point  $x$  so that  $|L_1| = |L_2|$  and  $|L_3| = 3$ , while both elements in  $L_3 - \{x\}$  are on  $|L_1|$  long lines of  $N$ . If  $|L_1| = 3$ , then  $N$  is the Fano plane  $F_7$ . If  $|L_1| = 4$ , then  $N$  is the ternary Reid geometry  $R_9$ .

Finally, we need a notion of connectivity. A *vertical  $k$ -separation* of a matroid  $M$  is a partition  $(X, Y)$  of  $E(M)$  so that  $r(X) + r(Y) - r(M) < k$  and  $\min(r(X), r(Y)) \geq k$ . A matroid  $M$  is *vertically  $k$ -connected* if it has no vertical  $j$ -separation with  $j < k$ .

### 3. THE MAXIMUM-SIZED MATROIDS

In this section, we describe two matroids that meet the bound of Theorem 1.3. We first show that the matrices  $A_r$  and  $A'_r$  are in fact 2-modular.

**Lemma 3.1.** *For each integer  $r \geq 2$ , the matrix  $A_r$  is 2-modular.*

*Proof.* Let  $r$  be minimal so that the lemma is false. Then  $r > 2$ . Let  $A$  be an  $r \times r$  submatrix of  $A_r$  so that  $|\det(A)| > 2$ . If  $A$  has a row with exactly one nonzero entry, then the determinant of  $A$  is  $\pm 1$  times the determinant of an  $(r-1) \times (r-1)$  submatrix of  $A_{r-1}$ , and so  $|\det(A)| \leq 2$ , by the minimality of  $r$ . Then each row of  $A$  has at least two nonzero entries, and, since each column of  $A_r$  has at most two nonzero entries, this implies that  $A$  has precisely two nonzero entries in each row and column. By permuting rows and columns of  $A$  and multiplying some rows and columns of  $A$  by  $-1$ , we may obtain a matrix  $A'$  for which all but at most one column has nonzero entries 1 and  $-1$ . If  $A'$  has no column with two entries equal to 1, then  $A'$  is unimodular. Otherwise, by expanding along a column with two ones, we see that the determinant of  $A$  is the sum or difference of the determinants of two unimodular matrices. In either case,  $|\det(A')| \leq 2$ . But  $|\det(A')| = |\det(A)|$ , so this contradicts the choice of  $A$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *For each integer  $r \geq 2$ , the matrix  $A'_r$  is 2-modular.*

*Proof.* For each integer  $r \geq 3$ , let  $H_r = [I_r | D_r | v]$ , where  $v = [1, -1, -1, 0, \dots, 0]^T$ . Then  $A'_r$  can be obtained from  $H_{r+1}$  by pivoting on the first entry of the last column, deleting the first row and last column, and then deleting two columns. This implies that each  $r \times r$  submatrix of  $A'_r$  has the same determinant as an  $(r+1) \times (r+1)$  submatrix of  $H_{r+1}$ , so it suffices to show that  $H_r$  is 2-modular for each  $r \geq 3$ .

Let  $r$  be minimal so that  $H_r$  is not 2-modular. Since deleting the last column of  $H_r$  gives a unimodular matrix and  $A'_2$  is clearly 2-modular,  $r > 3$ . Let  $A$  be an  $r \times r$  submatrix of  $H_r$  so that  $|\det(A)| > 2$ . Then the last column of  $H_r$  is a column of  $A$ . If  $A$  has a row with exactly one nonzero entry, then the determinant of  $A$  is  $\pm 1$  times the determinant of an  $(r-1) \times (r-1)$  submatrix of  $H_{r-1}$ , and so  $|\det(A)| \leq 2$ , by the minimality of  $r$ . So each row of  $A$  has at least two nonzero entries. Since  $A$  has at most  $2r+1$  total nonzero entries, this implies that at most one row of  $A$  has more than two nonzero entries.

Note that deleting the first or second row of  $H_r$  gives a unimodular matrix. So if the first or second row of  $A$  has exactly two nonzero entries, then expanding along that row shows that  $\det(A)$  is the sum or difference of the determinants of two unimodular matrices, which contradicts the assumption that  $|\det(A)| > 2$ . But then the first two rows of  $A$  each have at least three nonzero entries, a contradiction.  $\square$

The vector matroids of the matrices  $A_r$  and  $A'_r$  are both simplifications of elementary projections of  $M(K_{r+2})$ . For each integer  $r \geq 2$ , the matroid  $T_r$  is the simplification of the matroid obtained by projecting  $M(K_{r+2})$  by an element freely added to a 3-point line. The matrix  $A_r$  is a well-known representation [8] of  $T_r$ , so  $T_r$  is a 2-modular matroid by Lemma 3.1. Note that  $|T_r| = |M(K_{r+2})| - 2 = \binom{r+2}{2} - 2$ . We now define another modular cut of  $M(K_{r+2})$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  be 2-point lines of  $M(K_{r+2})$  so that  $L_1 \cup L_2$  is a 4-element circuit. Then the set of flats of  $M(K_{r+2})$  that contain  $L_1$  or  $L_2$  is a proper modular cut. Moreover, the corresponding single-element extension of  $M(K_{r+2})$  is represented over both  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\text{GF}(3)$  by the matrix  $[I_{r+1} | D_{r+1} | v]$ , where  $v = [1, -1, -1, 0, \dots, 0]^T$ .*

*Proof.* Note that the matrix  $H_{r+1} = [I_{r+1} | D_{r+1} | v]$  is a submatrix of  $A'_{r+1}$ , and is thus 2-modular, by Lemma 3.2. Therefore, the vector matroids of  $H_{r+1}$  over  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\text{GF}(3)$  are isomorphic; let  $M$  denote this matroid. Let  $e$  label the last column of  $H_{r+1}$ . Then  $M \setminus e$  is  $M(K_{r+2})$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the set of flats of  $M \setminus e$  that span  $e$  in  $M$ . Note that  $\mathcal{F}$  contains no 1-element flat, because  $M$  is simple. Let  $a, b, c, d$  be the labels of the columns  $[1, -1, 0, \dots, 0]^T$ ,  $[0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]^T$ ,  $[0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]^T$ , and  $[1, 0, -1, 0, \dots, 0]^T$ , respectively, of  $H_{r+1}$ . Then  $\{a, c, e\}$ ,  $\{b, d, e\}$ , and  $\{a, b, c, d\}$  are circuits of

$M$ , and so  $\{a, c\}$  and  $\{b, d\}$  are flats of  $M(K_{r+2})$  in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Let  $F_0$  denote the 6-element flat of  $M(K_{r+1})$  spanned by  $\{a, b, c, d\}$ ; then  $M(K_{r+2})|F_0 \cong M(K_4)$ . It is straightforward to check that  $\{a, c, e\}$  and  $\{b, d, e\}$  are the only lines of  $M|(F_0 \cup \{e\})$  that contain  $e$ .

Suppose that there is a flat  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  that does not contain  $\{a, c\}$  or  $\{b, d\}$ . Since  $F \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $F_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ , the flat  $L = F \cap F_0$  is in  $\mathcal{F}$  as well, by property (ii) of modular cuts. This flat  $L$  has rank less than three, since it does not contain  $\{a, c\}$  or  $\{b, d\}$ . It has size at least two, since  $M$  is simple. But  $\{a, c, e\}$  and  $\{b, d, e\}$  are the only long lines of  $M|(F_0 \cup \{e\})$  that contain  $e$ , which contradicts the existence of  $F$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{F}$  is precisely the set of flats that contain  $\{a, c\}$  or  $\{b, d\}$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is proper, the proposition holds.  $\square$

For each integer  $r \geq 2$ , let  $T'_r$  denote the simplification of the matroid obtained by projecting  $M(K_{r+2})$  by an element corresponding to the modular cut of Proposition 3.3. It is not hard to see that the matrix  $A'_r$  can be obtained from the real matrix  $[I_{r+1}|D_{r+1}|v]$  by pivoting on the first entry of the last column, deleting the first row and last column, and then deleting one column from each of the two parallel pairs. Thus,  $A'_r$  represents  $T'_r$  over  $\mathbb{R}$ , and so  $T'_r$  is a 2-modular matroid by Lemma 3.2. Note that  $|T'_r| = |M(K_{r+2})| - 2 = \binom{r+2}{2} - 2$ . The matroids  $T_r$  and  $T'_r$  are likely the unique simple rank- $r$  2-modular matroids of size  $\binom{r+2}{2} - 2$  for  $r \geq 5$ , but this seems difficult to prove.

#### 4. DUALITY AND EXCLUDED MINORS

In this section, we find several excluded minors for  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , and show that  $\mathcal{M}_2$  is closed under duality. We rely on the following result.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $A$  be a 2-modular representation of a rank- $r$  matroid  $M$ , and let  $e$  be a non-loop of  $M$  that labels the first column of  $A$ . Then there is a 2-modular matrix  $A'$  of the form  $[I_r|X]$  whose first column is labeled by  $e$  such that  $A'$  is obtained from  $A$  by elementary row operations and column swaps.*

*Proof.* Let  $A$  be a rank- $r$  matrix with first column label  $e$  so that the lemma fails for  $(A, e)$  and  $r$  is minimal. Then  $r \geq 2$ . We may assume that  $A$  has  $r$  rows. Let  $A_1$  be obtained from  $A$  by deleting a row so that the column of  $A_1$  labeled by  $e$  is nonzero; we may assume that we delete the last row of  $A$ .

By the minimality of  $r$ , there is a 2-modular matrix  $A_2$  of the form  $[I_{r-1}|X_2]$  whose first column is labeled by  $e$  such that  $A_2$  is obtained from  $A_1$  by elementary row operations and column swaps. Perform the same column swaps on the last row of  $A$  and then append the resulting row to  $A_2$  to give  $A_3$ . Let  $A_4$  be the matrix obtained from  $A_3$  by adding or subtracting rows to the last row so that the first  $r-1$  columns each have exactly one nonzero entry. By dividing the last row of  $A_4$  by two if necessary, we may assume that it has an entry in  $\{-1, 1\}$ . By pivoting on that entry and swapping columns, we obtain a matrix  $A_5$  of the form  $[I_r|X]$  that is row-equivalent to

a column permutation of  $A$ , where the first column is labeled by  $e$ . Since row operations and dividing by two do not increase the absolute value of the determinant of any  $r \times r$  submatrix,  $A_5$  is 2-modular.  $\square$

Since row operations do not change the vector matroid, Lemma 4.1 implies that  $\mathcal{M}_2$  is closed under duality (see [7, Theorem 2.2.8]).

**Corollary 4.2.** *The class  $\mathcal{M}_2$  of 2-modular matroids is closed under duality.*

Also, since every  $\Delta$ -modular matrix of the form  $[I_r|X]$  is in fact totally  $\Delta$ -modular, Lemma 4.1 implies that  $\mathcal{M}_2 = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_2$ . Unfortunately, the analogue of Lemma 4.1 is false for  $\Delta$ -modular matrices with  $\Delta \geq 3$ . For example, the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$$

with the first column labeled by  $e$  is 3-modular, but is not row-equivalent to a matrix with an  $I_2$ -submatrix that uses the first column. This is the main difficulty in showing that  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$  is closed under duality and that  $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_\Delta = \mathcal{M}_\Delta$  for  $\Delta \geq 3$ .

To find excluded minors for  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , we can use the fact that every matroid in  $\mathcal{M}_2$  is dyadic. The excluded minors for the class of dyadic matroids include  $U_{2,5}$ ,  $F_7$ ,  $\text{AG}(2,3)\setminus e$ ,  $\Delta(\text{AG}(2,3)\setminus e)$ ,  $T_8$ , and their duals. Here  $\Delta(\text{AG}(2,3)\setminus e)$  is obtained from  $\text{AG}(2,3)\setminus e$  by a  $\Delta$ - $Y$  exchange, while  $T_8$  is a self-dual ternary spike with the tip deleted [7, p. 649]. In fact, each of these matroids is an excluded minor for  $\mathcal{M}_2$ . The proof, which we omit, amounts to finding a 2-modular representation for each single-element deletion or contraction of each of these matroids. Also, since the ternary Reid geometry  $R_9$  has  $\text{AG}(2,3)\setminus e$  as a restriction,  $R_9$  is not in  $\mathcal{M}_2$ . There are two other known excluded minors for the class of dyadic matroids, namely  $N_1$  and  $N_2$  (see [7, Problem 14.7.11]). The matroid  $N_2$  may be an excluded minor for  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , but  $N_1$  is not, as we shall see shortly. To find excluded minors for  $\mathcal{M}_2$  that are dyadic, we use Lemma 4.1.

**Proposition 4.3.**  *$U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}$  is an excluded minor for  $\mathcal{M}_2$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $A$  is a 2-modular representation of  $U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}$  with four rows. By Lemma 4.1, we may assume that  $A$  has an  $I_4$ -submatrix. Since  $U_{2,4}$  is not regular, this implies that  $A$  has a  $4 \times 4$  block-diagonal submatrix where the determinant of each nonzero block has absolute value at least two. But then the determinant of this submatrix has absolute value at least four, a contradiction, so  $U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4} \notin \mathcal{M}_2$ . Each single-element contraction of  $U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}$  is isomorphic to  $U_{1,3} \oplus U_{2,4}$ , and it is easy to see that this matroid is in  $\mathcal{M}_2$ . Since  $U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}$  is self-dual, this implies that every minor of  $U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}$  is in  $\mathcal{M}_2$ .  $\square$

The matroid  $U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}$  is signed-graphic, which means that it has a representation over  $\text{GF}(3)$  so that each column has at most two nonzero

entries. In fact,  $\mathcal{M}_2$  has at least two other signed-graphic excluded minors, represented over  $\mathbb{R}$  by the following matrices:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

We write  $U_8$  for the vector matroid of the first matrix, and  $U'_8$  for the vector matroid of the second matrix. Both matroids are self-dual. One can prove that they are excluded minors for  $\mathcal{M}_2$  using a similar proof to that of Proposition 4.3. The excluded minor  $N_1$  for the dyadic matroids has a  $U_8$ -minor, but  $N_2$  does not have a minor isomorphic to  $U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}$ ,  $U_8$ , or  $U'_8$ , and thus it may be an excluded minor for  $\mathcal{M}_2$ .

Finding the excluded minors for  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$  likely becomes more difficult as  $\Delta$  increases. However, we have not yet solved the following.

**Problem 4.4.** *Find the rank-2 excluded minor for  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ .*

If  $p$  is the smallest prime greater than  $\Delta$ , then  $U_{2,p+2} \notin \mathcal{M}_\Delta$ , because every matroid in  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$  is  $\text{GF}(p)$ -representable. Also, it is not hard to see that  $U_{2,\Delta+2} \in \mathcal{M}_\Delta$  for each  $\Delta \geq 1$ , by taking the representation with two rows, two unit columns, and all columns of the form  $[1, m]^T$ , where  $1 \leq m \leq \Delta$ . This implies that if  $\Delta + 1$  is prime, then  $U_{2,\Delta+3}$  is an excluded minor for  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ . It is natural to conjecture that  $U_{2,p+2}$  is always an excluded minor for  $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ , where  $p$  is the smallest prime greater than  $\Delta$ . However, it appears (through Sage code) that the rank-2 excluded minor for  $\mathcal{M}_7$  is  $U_{2,11}$ , even though nine is not prime. Thus, it is unclear what the correct answer to Problem 4.4 may be as a function of  $\Delta$ .

## 5. SINGLE-ELEMENT EXTENSIONS

The remainder of this paper is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.3. In this section, we show that, up to isomorphism, there are only two rank- $r$  non-trivial single-element extensions of a clique that have no minor isomorphic to  $U_{2,5}$ ,  $F_7$ , or  $R_9$ . We need the following straightforward lemma to identify  $R_9$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $M$  be a simple rank-3 matroid on nine elements consisting of three long lines through a common point. Then either  $M$  has a  $U_{2,5}$ -minor, or  $M \cong R_9$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $M$  has no  $U_{2,5}$ -minor, and let  $x$  be a point that is on three long lines. Since  $|M| = 9$ , two of these lines have four points, and one has three points. Let  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  be the 4-point lines through  $x$ , and let  $\{x, y, z\}$  be the 3-point line through  $x$ . Since  $M$  has no  $U_{2,5}$ -minor, each element of  $L_1 - \{x\}$  is on a long line with  $y$  and a long line with  $z$ . Thus,  $y$  and  $z$  are both on four long lines of  $M$ , so  $M \cong R_9$ .  $\square$

We now show that, up to isomorphism, there are only two rank- $r$  non-trivial single-element extensions of a clique that have no minor isomorphic to  $U_{2,5}$ ,  $F_7$ , or  $R_9$ . Note that (a) implies that  $\text{si}((M/e)|X) \cong T_{r(M)-1}$ , and (b) implies that  $\text{si}((M/e)|X) \cong T'_{r(M)-1}$ .

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $M$  be a simple matroid of rank at least three with a set  $X$  so that  $M|X \cong M(K_{r(M)+1})$ , and let  $e \in E(M) - X$ . If  $M$  has no minor isomorphic to  $U_{2,5}$ ,  $F_7$ , or  $R_9$ , then either*

- (a) *the extension of  $M|X$  by  $e$  corresponds to the modular cut generated by a 3-point line, or*
- (b) *the extension of  $M|X$  by  $e$  corresponds to the modular cut generated by a pair of 2-point lines whose union is a circuit.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{L}$  denote the set of lines of  $M|X$  that span  $e$ . Since  $M|X \cong M(K_{r(M)+1})$ , each line in  $\mathcal{L}$  has size at most three. The 3-point lines in  $\mathcal{L}$  correspond to triangles of  $K_{r(M)+1}$ , and the 2-point lines in  $\mathcal{L}$  correspond to 2-edge matchings of  $K_{r(M)+1}$ .

**5.2.1.**  $\mathcal{L}$  is non-empty.

*Proof.* Assume that  $\mathcal{L}$  is empty. Then  $(M/e)|X$  is simple. Let  $M_1$  be a minimal simple minor of  $M$  of rank at least three so that

- $e \in E(M_1)$ ,
- there is a set  $X_1 \subseteq X$  so that  $M_1|X_1 \cong M(K_{r(M_1)+1})$ , and
- $(M_1/e)|X_1$  is simple.

Since  $M$  has no  $U_{2,6}$ -minor and  $(M_1/e)|X_1$  is simple, each plane of  $M_1|X_1$  that spans  $e$  has size at most four. Thus,  $r(M_1) \geq 4$ . By minimality, each element of  $X_1$  is in a plane of  $M_1|X_1$  that spans  $e$ . Each plane of  $M_1|X_1$  has size 3 or 4, corresponding to a 3-edge matching, or a triangle and disjoint edge. Since each plane of  $M_1|X_1$  is spanned by an  $M(K_m)$ -restriction of  $M_1|X_1$  for some  $m \leq 6$ , the minimality of  $M_1$  implies that  $r(M_1) \leq 5$ .

Suppose  $r(M_1) = 4$ . Then each element of  $X_1$  is in a 4-element plane of  $M_1|X_1$  that spans  $e$ . Since  $|X_1| = 10$ , there is some  $x \in X_1$  that is in at least two such planes. Each element of  $X_1$  is on at least three long lines of  $M_1|X_1$ , and is thus on at least three long lines of  $(M_1/e)|X_1$ , or else  $M_1/e$  has a  $U_{2,5}$ -restriction, since  $(M_1/e)|X_1$  is simple. But  $x$  is on two 4-point lines in  $M_1/e$ , so Lemma 5.1 implies that  $M_1$  has a minor isomorphic to  $U_{2,5}$  or  $R_9$ , a contradiction. Thus,  $r(M_1) = 5$ .

By the minimality of  $M_1$ , each plane of  $M_1|X_1$  that spans  $e$  has size three. Moreover, each element  $x \in X_1$  is in at least two planes of  $M_1|X_1$  that span  $e$ ; otherwise  $e$  is spanned by a unique line of  $(M/x)|(X - \{x\})$ , and this line has two points, so  $M_1/\{x, e\}$  has a  $U_{2,5}$ -restriction. We may assume that the ground set of  $M_1|X_1$  is the edge set of the complete graph with vertex set  $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ . Let  $x = 01$  and choose  $y = 02$ . We will show that  $M/\{e, y\}$  has at least three long lines through  $x$ , two of which have four points, and obtain a contradiction using Lemma 5.1. Let  $Z$  be the union of the three 3-point lines of  $M_1|X_1$  that contain  $x$  but not  $y$ .

Note that  $Z$  does not span  $e$  or  $y$  in  $M_1$ . Suppose  $(M_1/\{e, y\})|Z$  is not simple. Then there is a circuit  $\{x_1, x_2, e, y\}$  of  $M_1$  where  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  are in  $Z - \{x\}$ . Therefore,  $\{x, x_1, x_2\}$  is not a 3-edge matching in the  $K_6$  corresponding to  $M_1|X_1$ , contradicting the fact that each plane of  $M_1|X_1$  spanning  $e$  has size three. Thus,  $(M_1/\{e, y\})|Z$  is simple, so there are at least three long lines of  $M_1/\{e, y\}$  that contain  $x$ .

There is no plane of  $M_1|X_1$  that spans  $e$  and contains both  $x$  and  $y$ , since such a plane would have at least four elements. Since  $x$  is in at least two planes of  $M_1|X_1$  that span  $e$ , this implies that  $x$  is in at least two planes of  $(M_1/y)|(X_1 - \{y\})$  that span  $e$  in  $M_1/y$ . Moreover, these planes each have at least four points, since  $\text{si}((M_1/y)|(X_1 - \{y\})) \cong M(K_5)$  and so has no 3-point plane. Thus, in  $M_1/\{y, e\}$ , the element  $x$  is on at least two 4-point lines. Since  $x$  is on at least three long lines, Lemma 5.1 implies that  $M_1/\{e, y\}$  has an  $R_9$ -restriction or a  $U_{2,5}$ -minor, a contradiction.  $\square$

Since  $\mathcal{L}$  is non-empty, the sets in  $\mathcal{L}$  are pairwise disjoint and pairwise coplanar. To finish the proof, we will use the following two facts:

- (i) If  $F$  and  $F'$  are a modular pair of flats of  $M|X$  that both span  $e$ , then the flat  $F \cap F'$  spans  $e$  as well.
- (ii) If  $F$  and  $F'$  are flats of  $M|X$ , and  $M|F$  is isomorphic to a clique, then  $(F, F')$  is a modular pair.

First assume that  $\mathcal{L}$  contains a 3-point line  $L$ . If  $F$  is a flat of  $M|X$  that spans  $e$ , then  $F \cap L$  is a flat of  $M|X$  that spans  $e$ , by (i) and (ii). Since  $M$  is simple,  $r(F \cap L) \neq 1$ , so  $F$  contains  $L$ . Thus, (a) holds, so we may assume that each line in  $\mathcal{L}$  has size two. Then each such line corresponds to a 2-edge matching in  $K_{r(M)+1}$ . Since the lines in  $\mathcal{L}$  are pairwise coplanar, the union of two such lines corresponds to a 4-cycle of  $K_{r(M)+1}$ . Thus,  $|\mathcal{L}| \leq 3$ . Moreover, if  $\mathcal{L} = \{L_1, L_2, L_3\}$ , then  $M|(L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_3) \cong M(K_4)$ . As every element of  $M|(L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_3 \cup \{e\})$  is on three long lines,  $M|(L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L_3 \cup \{e\}) \cong F_7$ , a contradiction. Thus,  $|\mathcal{L}| \leq 2$ .

Let  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  be the two lines in  $\mathcal{L}$ , and let  $Z \subseteq X$  so that  $M|Z \cong M(K_4)$  and  $L_1 \cup L_2 \subseteq Z$ . If  $F$  is a flat of  $M|X$  that spans  $e$ , then  $F \cap Z$  is a flat of  $M|X$  that spans  $e$ , by (i) and (ii). Since  $M$  is simple, the flat  $F \cap Z$  has rank at least two. If  $F$  does not contain  $L_1$  or  $L_2$ , this implies that  $F \cap Z$  is a line of  $M|X$  other than  $L_1$  or  $L_2$ . This gives a contradiction as either  $\mathcal{L}$  contains a 3-point line, or  $|\mathcal{L}| > 2$ . We conclude that  $F$  contains  $L_1$  or  $L_2$ , and so (b) holds.  $\square$

Let  $M$  be a matroid with a set  $X$  so that  $M|X \cong M(K_{r(M)+1})$ . We say that an element  $e \in E(M) - X$  is *type-(a)* if  $e$  is freely added to a 3-point line of  $M|X$ , and is *type-(b)* if the extension of  $M|X$  by  $e$  corresponds to the modular cut generated by a pair of 2-point lines of  $M|X$  whose union is a circuit. Proposition 5.2 says that if  $M$  is simple and has no minor isomorphic to  $U_{2,5}$ ,  $F_7$ , or  $R_9$ , then every element in  $E(M) - X$  is type-(a) or type-(b).

Also note that  $e$  is type-(a) if and only if  $\text{si}((M/e)|X) \cong T_{r(M)-1}$ , and  $e$  is type-(b) if and only if  $\text{si}((M/e)|X) \cong T'_{r(M)-1}$ .

## 6. TWO-ELEMENT EXTENSIONS

We now additionally exclude  $U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}$  as a minor, and analyze the structure of a 2-element extension of a clique. In a matroid  $M$ , for sets  $A, B \subseteq E(M)$ , we write  $\sqcap(A, B)$  for  $r_M(A) + r_M(B) - r_M(A \cup B)$ .

**Lemma 6.1.** *Let  $M$  be a simple matroid of rank at least five with no minor in  $\{U_{2,5}, F_7, R_9, U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}\}$ , and with a set  $X$  so that  $M|X \cong M(K_{r(M)+1})$ . If  $e, f \in E(M) - X$  so that  $e$  is type-(a) and  $f$  is type-(b), then there is a set  $Z \subseteq X$  so that  $M|Z \cong M(K_4)$  and  $e, f \in \text{cl}_M(Z)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $e$  is a type-(a) element, there is a 3-point line  $L_1$  of  $M|X$  so that  $e$  is freely added to  $L_1$ . By Proposition 3.3, since  $f$  is a type-(b) element, there are 2-point lines  $L_2$  and  $L'_2$  of  $M|X$  so that  $L_2 \cup L'_2$  is a 4-element circuit, and a flat  $F$  of  $M|X$  spans  $f$  if and only if  $F$  contains  $L_2$  or  $L'_2$ .

We may assume that  $\text{cl}_M(L_2 \cup L'_2)$  does not contain  $e$  otherwise the lemma holds. Thus  $\sqcap(L_2 \cup L'_2, L_1) \neq 2$ . If  $\sqcap(L_2 \cup L'_2, L_1) = 0$ , then  $L_1 \cup \{e\}$  and  $\text{cl}_{M|X}(L_2 \cup L'_2)$  are skew rank-2 sets in  $M/f$  each with four points, so  $M$  has  $U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}$  as a minor, a contradiction. We deduce that  $\sqcap(L_2 \cup L'_2, L_1) = 1$ . Hence there is some  $Z \subseteq X$  such that  $L_1 \cup L_2 \cup L'_2 \subseteq Z$  and  $M|Z \cong M(K_5)$ . Let  $Z \subseteq Y \subseteq X$  so that  $M|Y \cong M(K_6)$ . We may assume that the ground set of  $M|Y$  is the edge set of the complete graph with vertex set  $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ , and that the ground set of  $M|Z$  is the edge set of the complete graph with vertex set  $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ . As  $\sqcap(L_2 \cup L'_2, L_1) = 1$ , we may assume that  $L_1 = \{01, 02, 12\}$ , and  $L_2 = \{13, 24\}$ .

Suppose that  $\{z, e, f\}$  is a circuit of  $M$  for some  $z \in Z$ . Then either  $z$  meets 0, 1, or 2, or  $z = 34$ . In the first case,  $L_1 \cup \{z\}$  spans an  $M(K_4)$ -restriction of  $M|X$ , so  $f$  is spanned by a plane of  $M|X$  that does not contain  $L_2$  or  $L'_2$ , a contradiction. If  $z = 34$ , then  $e \in \text{cl}_M(L_2 \cup L'_2)$ , a contradiction. Thus, no such element  $z$  exists.

Assume that  $L'_2 = \{14, 23\}$ . As  $e \notin \text{cl}_M(L_2 \cup L'_2)$ , the elements 13, 14, 12, 34 are on distinct lines of  $M/e$  through  $f$ . The sets  $\{f, 13, 24\}$  and  $\{f, 14, 23\}$  have rank two in  $M/e$ , and do not span any element in  $\{03, 04, 34\}$ , otherwise  $e$  is spanned by a plane of  $M|Z$  that does not contain  $L_1$ , a contradiction. Since there are at most four lines of  $(M/e)|(Z \cup \{f\})$  through  $f$ , and  $\{03, 04, 34\}$  has rank two in  $(M/e)|(Z \cup \{f\})$ , it follows that  $\{03, 04, 34, f\}$  is a  $U_{2,4}$ -restriction of  $(M/e)|(Z \cup \{f\})$ . But  $\{01, 03, 04, 05\}$  is a basis of  $(M/e)|Y$ , and  $\{01, 05, 15, 25\}$  is a  $U_{2,4}$ -restriction of  $M/e$ , since it spans  $L_1$  in  $M$ . Thus,  $M/e$  has a  $(U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4})$ -restriction, a contradiction.

Now assume that  $L'_2 = \{12, 34\}$ . Let  $N = (M/e)|(Z \cup \{f\})$ , and let  $N' = N \setminus \{01, 02\}$ . Then  $N'$  is a simple rank-3 matroid on nine elements. The sets  $\{12, 03, 13, 23\}$  and  $\{12, 04, 14, 24\}$  are lines of  $N'$  because they span  $e$  in  $M$ , and the set  $\{12, 34, f\}$  is a line of  $N'$  because it is a line of  $M$  that

does not span  $e$ . But then  $N'$  has a  $U_{2,5}$ -minor or  $N' \cong R_9$ , by Lemma 5.1, a contradiction.  $\square$

The following lemma imposes structure on a different 2-element extension of a clique.

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $M$  be a simple matroid of rank at least six with no minor in  $\{U_{2,5}, F_7, R_9, U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}\}$  and with a set  $X$  so that  $M|X \cong M(K_{r(M)+1})$ . Let  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  be distinct 4-element circuits of  $M|X$  so that, for each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , there is an element  $e_i \in E(M) - X$  spanned by both 2-point lines of  $M|X$  contained in  $C_i$ . Then  $|C_1 \cap C_2| = 2$ , and there is a set  $Z \subseteq X$  so that  $M|Z \cong M(K_5)$  and  $C_1 \cup C_2 \subseteq Z$ .*

*Proof.* We may assume that  $E(M) = X \cup \{e_1, e_2\}$ . Note that  $e_1 \neq e_2$ , and that  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are both type-(b). Let  $x$  and  $y$  be distinct elements in  $\text{cl}_{M|X}(C_1) - C_1$ . Then either  $x$  or  $y$  is not in  $\text{cl}_{M|X}(C_2)$ , or  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are contained in an  $M(K_4)$ -restriction of  $M|X$  and the lemma follows. Assume that  $x \notin \text{cl}_{M|X}(C_2)$ . The matroid  $(M/x)|(X - \{x\})$  has a spanning-clique restriction, and  $e_2$  is spanned by both 2-point lines of  $(M/x)|(X - \{x\})$  contained in  $C_2$ . Moreover, the simplification of  $(M/x)|(C_1 \cup \{y\})$  is a 3-point line,  $L$ , that spans  $e_1$  in  $M/x$ . Then  $L \cup C_2$  is contained in an  $M(K_4)$ -restriction of  $M/x$ , by Lemma 6.1. Since  $C_1$  spans  $x$  in  $M$ , this implies that there is a set  $Z \subseteq X$  so that  $M|Z \cong M(K_5)$  and  $C_1 \cup C_2 \subseteq Z$ .

We now prove that  $|C_1 \cap C_2| = 2$ . We may assume that the ground set of  $M|Z$  is the edge set of the complete graph with vertex set  $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ . Assume that  $|C_1 \cap C_2| \neq 2$ . Then  $|C_1 \cap C_2| = 1$  since  $K_5$  has no edge-disjoint 4-cycles. We may assume without loss of generality that  $C_1 = \{01, 12, 23, 03\}$ , and that 01 is the unique element in  $C_1 \cap C_2$ ; this implies that  $C_2 = \{01, 14, 42, 02\}$ .

Suppose there is an element  $z \in Z$  for which  $\{z, e_1, e_2\}$  is a circuit of  $M$ . Assume  $z$  is in  $\text{cl}_M(C_1)$  or  $\text{cl}_M(C_2)$ . Then  $C_1$  or  $C_2$  spans both  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ . Since  $\{\text{cl}_M(C_1), \text{cl}_M(C_2)\}$  is a modular pair of flats of  $M$  whose intersection contains  $\{01, 12, 02\}$  and  $e_1$  or  $e_2$ , we deduce that  $e_1$  or  $e_2$  is spanned by  $\{01, 12, 02\}$ , a contradiction. We conclude that  $z \notin \text{cl}_M(C_1) \cup \text{cl}_M(C_2)$ . Thus,  $z = 34$ , so  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are distinct 4-element circuits of a simplification of  $(M/z)|(Z - \{z\})$  that span  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ , respectively. Hence  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  are not parallel in  $M/z$ , a contradiction.

The set  $\{01, 02, 03, 13\}$  is a  $U_{2,4}$ -restriction of  $M/e_1$ . Since 01 and 23 are parallel in  $M/e_1$  and  $\{e_2, 01, 24\}$  is a line of  $M$  and  $\{e_1, e_2\}$  spans no element of  $X$ , the set  $\{01, 24, 34, e_2\}$  is a  $U_{2,4}$ -restriction of  $M/e_1$ . Since  $\{01, 04, 14\}$  is a  $U_{2,3}$ -restriction of  $M/e_1$  and  $M/e_1 \setminus \{12, 23\}$  is simple, Lemma 5.1 implies that  $M/e_1$  restricted to the union of the three sets  $\{01, 02, 03, 13\}$ ,  $\{01, 24, 34, e_2\}$ , and  $\{01, 04, 14\}$  is either isomorphic to  $R_9$ , or has a  $U_{2,5}$ -minor, a contradiction.  $\square$

7.  $k$ -ELEMENT EXTENSIONS

In this section, we place structure on  $k$ -element extensions of a clique with  $k \geq 3$ , in three cases. We say that a point  $x$  of a simple matroid  $M$  is *special* if it is on at least two 4-point lines, is a tip of at least two spike restrictions of  $M$ , or is a tip of a spike restriction of  $M$  and is on a 4-point line.

**Lemma 7.1.** *Let  $M$  be a simple matroid with no minor in  $\{U_{2,5}, F_7, R_9\}$ , and with a set  $X$  so that  $M|X \cong M(K_{r(M)+1})$ . If  $|E(M) - X| \leq 3$ , then  $M$  has at most 21 special points.*

*Proof.* Since  $|E(M) - X| \leq 3$  and  $M$  has no  $U_{2,5}$ -restriction, there are at most six elements in  $X$  that are spanned by a pair of elements in  $E(M) - X$ . By Proposition 5.2, there are at most 12 elements in  $X$  that are on a line of  $M|X$  that spans an element of  $E(M) - X$ . Thus, there are at most 18 elements in  $X$  that are on a long line of  $M$  that is not a long line of  $M|X$ . Because no spike is graphic,  $M|X$  has no spike restriction. Therefore, at most 18 elements in  $X$  are a tip of a spike or on a 4-point line. Since  $|E(M) - X| \leq 3$ , it follows that  $M$  has at most 21 special points.  $\square$

We must work harder when  $|E(M) - X|$  is not bounded.

**Lemma 7.2.** *Let  $M$  be a simple matroid with no minor in  $\{U_{2,5}, F_7, R_9, U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}\}$ , and with a set  $X$  so that  $M|X \cong M(K_{r(M)+1})$ . If  $|E(M) - X| \geq 4$  and each element in  $E(M) - X$  is type-(a), then  $M$  has at most one special point.*

*Proof.* We may assume that the ground set of  $M|X$  is the edge set of the complete graph with vertex set  $\{1, 2, \dots, r(M) + 1\}$ . Since each point in  $E(M) - X$  is type-(a), each is freely added to a 3-point line of  $M|X$ . Let  $\mathcal{L}$  denote the set of 3-point lines of  $M|X$  that span an element of  $E(M) - X$ . Since  $M$  has no  $(U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4})$ -minor, each pair of lines in  $\mathcal{L}$  has a common element. As  $|E(M) - X| \geq 4$ , there is an element  $x$  that is in each line in  $\mathcal{L}$  otherwise  $M$  has a restriction that can be obtained from  $M(K_4)$  by adding a point to each long line. In the exceptional case,  $M$  has a  $U_{2,5}$ -minor, a contradiction. Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $x = 12$ . Note that the points of  $(M/x)|(X - \{x\})$  of size at least two form a basis of  $\text{si}((M/x)|(X - \{x\}))$ ; this implies that  $E(M) - X$  is independent in  $M$ .

**7.2.1.** *Let  $e_1, e_2 \in E(M) - X$ , and, for each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $L_i$  be a line in  $\mathcal{L}$  that spans  $e_i$ . If  $z \in X$  so that  $\{z, e_1, e_2\}$  is a circuit of  $M$ , then  $z$  is the unique element in  $\text{cl}_{M|X}(L_1 \cup L_2) - (L_1 \cup L_2)$ . Moreover, every 4-point line of  $M$  contains exactly three elements of  $X$  including  $x$ .*

*Proof.* Certainly  $z \in \text{cl}_M(L_1 \cup L_2)$  since  $\{z, e_1, e_2\}$  is a circuit. If  $z \in L_1$ , then  $L_1$  spans  $e_2$ . But then  $L_1$  is a flat of  $M|X$  that spans  $e_2$  but does not contain  $L_2$ , which contradicts Proposition 5.2(i). Thus,  $z \notin L_1$ , and, by symmetry,  $z \notin L_2$ . Since  $|\text{cl}_{M|X}(L_1 \cup L_2)| = 6$  and  $|L_1 \cup L_2| = 5$ , the element  $z$  is unique. As  $E(M) - X$  is independent, it follows that each 4-point line of  $M$  contains exactly three elements of  $X$  including  $x$ .  $\square$

By 7.2.1, if an element  $y$  of  $X$  is on a line in  $\mathcal{L}$ , then each long line of  $M$  through  $y$  is spanned by a long line of  $M|X$  through  $y$ . As no spike is graphic,  $y$  is not a tip of a spike restriction of  $M$ . Moreover, if  $y \neq x$ , then  $y$  is on exactly one 4-point line of  $M$ , so  $X$  contains at most one special point of  $M$  that is on a line in  $\mathcal{L}$ .

If an element  $y$  of  $X$  is not on a line in  $\mathcal{L}$ , then  $y$  is not on a 4-point line, since  $E(M) - X$  is independent. By 7.2.1, the element  $y$  is on at most one more long line in  $M$  than in  $M|X$ , which implies that  $y$  is a tip of at most one spike restriction of  $M$ . Thus,  $y$  is not a special point. Therefore,  $M$  has at most one special point in  $X$ .

Now, let  $e \in E(M) - X$ . We will show that  $e$  is not special. We may assume that  $e$  is freely added to the 3-point line  $L' = \{12, 13, 23\}$  of  $M|X$ . By 7.2.1, each long line of  $M$  through  $e$  contains an element of  $X$  that uses the vertex 3. Let  $T$  be a transversal of the points of  $M/e$  so that each element in  $T$  is in  $X$  and uses the vertex 3; then  $T$  is independent in  $M|X$ . Also,  $T$  contains at most one of 13 and 23, and so  $T$  does not span  $L'$  in  $M|X$ . Since  $e$  is freely added to  $L'$ , this implies that  $T$  does not span  $e$  in  $M$ . Since  $T$  is independent in  $M$  and does not span  $e$ , the element  $e$  is not a tip of a spike restriction of  $M$ . Since  $e$  is on exactly one 4-point line of  $M$ , the element  $e$  is not special. Thus,  $M$  has no special point in  $E(M) - X$  and at most one special point in  $X$ , so the lemma holds.  $\square$

We need an analogous lemma for a different case.

**Lemma 7.3.** *Let  $M$  be a simple matroid with no minor in  $\{U_{2,5}, F_7, R_9, U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}\}$ , and with a set  $X$  so that  $M|X \cong M(K_{r(M)+1})$ . If there is a 3-point line  $\{x, y, z\}$  of  $M|X$  so that each element in  $E(M) - X$  is either freely added to  $\{x, y, z\}$ , or is spanned by both 2-point lines of  $M|X$  in some 4-element circuit of  $M|X$  containing  $x$  and  $y$ , then  $M$  has at most two special points.*

*Proof.* Let  $L = \{x, y, z\}$ . We may assume that the ground set of  $M|X$  is the edge set of the complete graph with vertex set  $\{1, 2, \dots, r(M) + 1\}$ , and that  $(x, y, z) = (12, 13, 23)$ . By Proposition 5.2, each element in  $E(M) - X$  that is not freely added to  $L$  is type-(b). Let  $\mathcal{C}$  denote the set of circuits  $C$  of  $M|X$  for which both 2-point lines of  $M|X$  in  $C$  span a common element of  $E(M) - X$ . By hypothesis, each circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$  contains  $x$  and  $y$ .

The points of  $(M/x)|(X - \{x\})$  of size at least two form a basis of  $\text{si}((M/x)|(X - \{x\}))$  because they all use the composite vertex obtained by identifying 1 and 2. This implies that  $E(M) - X$  is independent in  $M$ . Since  $E(M) - X$  is independent, there is at most one 4-point line of  $M$ , namely  $\text{cl}_M(L)$ .

**7.3.1.** *Let  $e_1, e_2 \in E(M) - X$  so that neither is freely added to  $L$ , and, for each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $C_i$  be a circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$  that spans  $e_i$ . If  $w \in X$  so that  $\{w, e_1, e_2\}$  is a circuit of  $M$ , then  $w$  is the unique element in  $\text{cl}_{M|X}(C_1 \cup C_2) - (\text{cl}_{M|X}(C_1) \cup \text{cl}_{M|X}(C_2))$ .*

*Proof.* Certainly  $w \in \text{cl}_M(C_1 \cup C_2)$ , since  $\{w, e_1, e_2\}$  is a circuit. If  $w \in \text{cl}_{M|X}(C_1)$ , then  $\text{cl}_{M|X}(C_1)$  is a flat of  $M|X$  that spans  $e_2$ , but does not contain either 2-point line of  $M|X$  contained in  $C_2$ , which contradicts that  $e_2$  is of type-(b). Thus,  $w \notin \text{cl}_M(C_1)$ , and, by symmetry,  $w \notin \text{cl}_M(C_2)$ . As  $C_1 \cap C_2 = \{x, y\}$ , it follows that  $|\text{cl}_{M|X}(C_1 \cup C_2)| = 10$  and  $|\text{cl}_{M|X}(C_1) \cup \text{cl}_{M|X}(C_2)| = 9$ . Thus, the element  $w$  is unique.  $\square$

The following deals with a slightly different case.

**7.3.2.** *Let  $e \in E(M) - X$  be freely added to  $L$ , and let  $f \in E(M) - (X \cup e)$  be spanned by a circuit  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ . If  $w \in X$  so that  $\{w, e, f\}$  is a circuit of  $M$ , then  $w$  is the unique element in  $\text{cl}_{M|X}(C) - (L \cup C)$ .*

*Proof.* Certainly  $w \in \text{cl}_{M|X}(C)$ , since  $C$  spans  $L$  and  $\{w, e, f\}$  is a circuit. If  $w \in L$ , then  $\text{cl}_M(L)$  contains  $\{x, y, z, e, f\}$ , a contradiction. If  $w \in C$ , then there is a 2-point line of  $M|X$  that contains  $w$  and spans  $e$  but does not contain  $L$ , which contradicts the fact that  $e$  is freely added to  $L$ . Since  $|\text{cl}_{M|X}(C)| = 6$  and  $|L \cup C| = 5$ , the element  $w$  is unique.  $\square$

If  $w \in X - L$  is in a circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$ , then  $w$  is incident to one of the vertices 2 and 3. This implies that there is no pair  $(L, C)$  or  $(C_1, C_2)$  with  $C, C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}$  so that  $w$  is the unique element in  $\text{cl}_{M|X}(C) - (L \cup C)$  or  $\text{cl}_{M|X}(C_1 \cup C_2) - (\text{cl}_{M|X}(C_1) \cup \text{cl}_{M|X}(C_2))$ . So, by 7.3.1 and 7.3.2, there is no pair of elements in  $E(M) - X$  that span  $w$ . Since  $w \notin L$  and each circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$  contains  $x$  and  $y$ , the element  $w$  is in exactly one circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Therefore,  $w$  is on exactly one long line,  $L'$ , of  $M$  that is not a long line of  $M|X$ . Thus,  $w$  is a tip of at most one spike in  $M$ , otherwise  $M$  has a spike not using the line  $L'$ , so the graphic matroid  $M|X$  has a spike, a contradiction. Since  $w \notin L$ , it is not on a 4-point line, so it is not special.

Since  $z = 23$ , we see that  $z \in L$  and  $z \in \text{cl}_{M|X}(C)$  for all  $C \in \mathcal{C}$ . So, by 7.3.1 and 7.3.2, there is no pair of elements in  $E(M) - X$  that span  $z$ . This implies that each long line of  $M$  through  $z$  is spanned by a long line of  $M|X$  through  $z$ , so  $z$  is not a tip of a spike. Since  $z$  is on at most one 4-point line, it is not special.

If  $w \in X - L$  is not in a circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$ , then there is at most one pair  $(L, C)$  or  $(C_1, C_2)$  with  $C, C_1, C_2 \in \mathcal{C}$  so that  $w$  is the unique element in  $\text{cl}_{M|X}(C) - (L \cup C)$  or  $\text{cl}_{M|X}(C_1 \cup C_2) - (\text{cl}_{M|X}(C_1) \cup \text{cl}_{M|X}(C_2))$ . So, by 7.3.1 and 7.3.2, there is at most one pair of elements in  $E(M) - X$  that span  $w$ . Then, since  $w$  is not in a circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$  and is not in  $L$ , it is on at most one long line of  $M$  that is not a long line of  $M|X$ . Thus, it is a tip of at most one spike. Since  $w \notin L$ , it is not on a 4-point line, so it is not special. Therefore,  $M$  has at most two special points in  $X$ .

Now, let  $e \in E(M) - X$ . We will show that  $e$  is not special. We consider two cases. First assume that  $e$  is freely added to  $L$ . As  $E(M) - X$  is independent, by 7.3.2, each long line of  $M$  through  $e$  contains an element of  $X$  that uses the vertex 1. Let  $T$  be a transversal of the non-trivial parallel classes of  $M/e$  so that each element in  $T$  is in  $X$  and uses the vertex 1. Then

$T$  is independent in  $M|X$ . Also,  $T$  contains at most one of 12 and 13, and so  $T$  does not span  $L$  in  $M|X$ , which implies that  $T$  does not span  $e$  in  $M$ . Since  $T$  is independent in  $M$  and does not span  $e$ , the element  $e$  is not a tip of a spike restriction of  $M$ . Since  $e$  is on at most one 4-point line of  $M$ , the element  $e$  is not special.

Now assume that  $e$  is not freely added to  $L$ . Then  $e$  is a type-( $b$ ) element and is on no 4-point lines of  $M$ . Let  $C$  be a circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$  so that both 2-point lines of  $M|X$  in  $C$  span  $e$ . We may assume that  $C = \{12, 24, 43, 31\}$ . Then  $\{12, 34\}$  and  $\{13, 24\}$  both span  $e$ . By 7.3.2 and 7.3.1, each long line of  $M$  through  $e$  contains an element of  $X$  that uses the vertex 4. Let  $T$  be a transversal of the non-trivial parallel classes of  $M/e$  so that each element in  $T$  is in  $X$  and uses the vertex 4. Then  $T$  is independent in  $M|X$ . Note that  $T$  contains 24 and 34, and that  $T - \{24\}$  does not span  $\{12, 34\}$  or  $\{13, 24\}$  in  $M$ . Since  $e$  is of type-( $b$ ), this implies that  $T - \{24\}$  does not span  $e$ . Then  $T - \{24\}$  is an independent set that does not span  $e$ , and is a transversal of all but one long line of  $M$  through  $e$ . Thus,  $e$  is a tip of at most one spike. Since  $e$  is not on a 4-point line of  $M$ , this implies that  $e$  is not special. Thus,  $M$  has no special point in  $E(M) - X$ , and at most two special points in  $X$ , so the lemma holds.  $\square$

## 8. THE SPANNING-CLIQUE CASE

We prove the following result for matroids with a spanning-clique restriction. Recall that a point  $x$  of a simple matroid  $M$  is *special* if it is on at least two 4-point lines, is a tip of at least two spike restrictions of  $M$ , or is a tip of a spike restriction of  $M$  and is on a 4-point line.

**Proposition 8.1.** *Let  $M$  be a simple matroid of rank at least six with a spanning-clique restriction. If  $M$  has no minor in  $\{U_{2,5}, F_7, R_9, U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}\}$ , then*

- (i)  $|M| \leq \binom{r(M)+2}{2} - 2$ , and
- (ii)  $M$  has at most 21 special points.

*Proof.* Let  $M|X \cong M(K_{r(M)+1})$ . Note that  $|M| \leq \binom{r(M)+2}{2} - 2$  if and only if  $|E(M) - X| \leq r(M) - 1$ . By Proposition 5.2, each element of  $E(M) - X$  is either freely added to a 3-point line of  $M|X$ , or corresponds to the modular cut generated by a pair of 2-point lines of  $M|X$  whose union is a circuit. Let  $\mathcal{L}$  be the set of 3-point lines of  $M|X$  that span an element in  $E(M) - X$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the set of 4-element circuits  $C$  of  $M|X$  for which both 2-point lines of  $M|X$  contained in  $C$  span a common element of  $E(M) - X$ .

Clearly each line in  $\mathcal{L}$  spans exactly one element of  $E(M) - X$ , or else  $M$  has a  $U_{2,5}$ -restriction. If there is a pair  $\{L, L'\}$  of 2-point lines  $L$  and  $L'$  of  $M|X$  whose union is a circuit so that  $L$  and  $L'$  each span elements  $e$  and  $f$  in  $E(M) - X$ , then  $L \cup \{e, f\}$  and  $L' \cup \{e, f\}$  are distinct lines of  $M$  that intersect in two points, a contradiction. Thus,  $|E(M) - X| = |\mathcal{L}| + |\mathcal{C}|$ .

We first deal with the case when two circuits in  $\mathcal{C}$  span each other.

**8.1.1.** *If there are distinct circuits  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  whose union is contained in an  $M(K_4)$ -restriction of  $M|X$ , then  $|E(M) - X| \leq 3$ , and (i) and (ii) hold.*

*Proof.* For each  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $e_i$  be the element of  $M$  that is spanned by each 2-point line of  $M|X$  contained in  $C_i$ . Since  $C_1 \cup C_2$  is contained in an  $M(K_4)$ -restriction of  $M|X$ , there is a line  $\{x, y\}$  of  $M|X$  contained in both  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ .

Suppose that  $\mathcal{L} \neq \emptyset$ , and let  $L \in \mathcal{L}$ . Then  $L \subseteq C_1 \cup C_2$ , or else either  $(L, C_1)$  or  $(L, C_2)$  violates Lemma 6.1. Either  $x$  or  $y$  is in  $L$ , since every triangle of  $K_4$  intersects every size-2 matching; assume without loss of generality that  $x \in L$ . But then  $x$  is on the 4-point lines  $\text{cl}_M(L)$  and  $\{x, y, e_1, e_2\}$ , and also a 3-point line other than  $L$  in  $C_1 \cup C_2$ , a contradiction to Lemma 5.1. Thus,  $\mathcal{L} = \emptyset$ .

If there is some circuit  $C_3 \in \mathcal{C}$  that is not contained in  $C_1 \cup C_2$ , then there are at most two elements of  $C_3$  in  $C_1 \cup C_2$ . Since  $|C_1 \cap C_3| = 2$  and  $|C_2 \cap C_3| = 2$  by Lemma 6.2, this implies that  $C_3$  contains  $\{x, y\}$ . But the only 4-element circuits of  $M|X$  that contain  $\{x, y\}$  are  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ . Thus, each circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$  is contained in  $C_1 \cup C_2$ . Since  $C_1 \cup C_2$  is contained in an  $M(K_4)$ -restriction of  $M|X$ , it follows that  $|\mathcal{C}| \leq 3$ . Then  $|E(M) - X| \leq 3$  so (i) holds, and (ii) holds by Lemma 7.1.  $\square$

Next we treat the case when the lines in  $\mathcal{L}$  do not share a common element.

**8.1.2.** *If there is no element of  $X$  contained in each line in  $\mathcal{L}$ , then  $|E(M) - X| = 3$ , and (i) and (ii) hold.*

*Proof.* First note that each pair of lines in  $\mathcal{L}$  intersect since  $M|X$  is binary. This implies, since the lines in  $\mathcal{L}$  do not share a common element, that  $|\mathcal{L}| \in \{3, 4\}$  and the union  $Z$  of the lines in  $\mathcal{L}$  satisfies  $M|Z \cong M(K_4)$ . If  $|\mathcal{L}| = 4$  and  $a \in Z$ , then, as  $M$  has no  $U_{2,5}$ -minor,  $a$  is on three long lines in a 9-element restriction of  $M| \text{cl}_M(Z)$ , a contradiction to Lemma 5.1. Thus,  $|\mathcal{L}| = 3$  and there are three elements  $x, y, z \in Z$  that are each on two lines in  $\mathcal{L}$ .

By Lemma 6.1, each circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$  is contained in  $Z$ , and so each circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$  contains one of  $x, y, z$ , since  $|Z| = 6$ . But then one of  $x, y, z$  is on two 4-point lines and a 3-point line of  $M| \text{cl}_M(Z)$ , so  $M$  has an  $R_9$ -restriction or a  $U_{2,5}$ -minor by Lemma 5.1. This is a contradiction, so  $\mathcal{C} = \emptyset$ , and so  $|E(M) - X| = 3$ . Then  $|E(M) - X| \leq 3$  so (i) holds, and (ii) holds by Lemma 7.1.  $\square$

We now consider four cases, depending on the size of  $\mathcal{L}$ . Suppose first that  $|\mathcal{L}| \geq 3$ . By 8.1.2, the lines in  $\mathcal{L}$  share a common element  $x$ ; thus,  $|\mathcal{L}| \leq r(M) - 1$ . Since  $|\mathcal{L}| \geq 3$ , the set  $\mathcal{C}$  is empty, or else there is a line  $L \in \mathcal{L}$  and a circuit  $C \in \mathcal{C}$  so that  $(L, C)$  violates Lemma 6.1. Then  $|E(M) - X| = |\mathcal{L}| \leq r(M) - 1$ , and (i) holds. Also, (ii) holds by Lemma 7.2 if  $|\mathcal{L}| \geq 4$  and by Lemma 7.1 if  $|\mathcal{L}| = 3$ .

Next assume that  $|\mathcal{L}| = 2$ . The union of the two lines in  $\mathcal{L}$  is contained in an  $M(K_4)$ -restriction  $M|Z$  of  $M|X$ , and by Lemma 6.1, each circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$  is contained in  $Z$ . By Lemma 5.1, the element  $x$  that is on both lines in  $\mathcal{L}$  is in no circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$ . This implies that  $|\mathcal{C}| \leq 1$ , and so  $|E(M) - X| \leq 3 \leq r(M) - 1$ , and (ii) holds by Lemma 7.1.

Now suppose that  $|\mathcal{L}| = 1$ . Let  $L \in \mathcal{L}$ , and let  $e$  be the element of  $E(M) - X$  that is spanned by  $L$ . By 8.1.1, we may assume that each circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$  spans at most one element of  $E(M) - X$  other than  $e$ . By Lemma 6.1, each circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$  contains two elements of  $L$ . If, for two different circuits  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , we have  $C_1 \cap L \neq C_2 \cap L$ , then, as  $r(C_1 \cup C_2) = 4$ , we see that  $|C_1 \cap C_2| = 1$ , which contradicts Lemma 6.2. Thus, there are elements  $x$  and  $y$  in  $L$  that are contained in each circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$ . This implies that  $|\mathcal{C}| \leq r(M) - 2$ , and so  $|E(M) - X| \leq r(M) - 1$ . Also, (ii) holds by Lemma 7.3.

Finally, suppose that  $|\mathcal{L}| = 0$ . By 8.1.1, we may assume that each  $M(K_4)$ -restriction of  $M|X$  spans at most one element of  $E(M) - X$ . By Lemma 6.2, each pair of these  $M(K_4)$ -restrictions has a common triangle. If there is no shared triangle among all of these restrictions, then there are exactly three  $M(K_4)$ -restrictions of  $M|X$  that span an element of  $E(M) - X$ , and they are contained in an  $M(K_5)$ -restriction of  $M|X$ . Then  $|E(M) - X| = 3$ , so (i) and (ii) hold, using Lemma 7.1. Otherwise, there is a common triangle  $L$  contained in each  $M(K_4)$ -restriction that spans an element of  $E(M) - X$ . By the same reasoning at the end of the previous case, there are elements  $x$  and  $y$  in  $L$  that are contained in each circuit in  $\mathcal{C}$ , and so (i) and (ii) hold.  $\square$

## 9. THE PROOFS OF THE MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.3 and 1.1. We use two results of Geelen, Nelson, and Walsh [3]. The first finds structure in a minimal counterexample. The second, which is a consequence of Theorem 7.6.1 in [3], allows us to move from a clique minor to a spanning-clique restriction.

**Theorem 9.1.** *There is a function  $rg_{9.1}: \mathbb{R}^6 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  so that, for all integers  $\ell, k \geq 2$  and  $t, s \geq 1$ , and any real polynomial  $p(x) = ax^2 + bx + c$  with  $a > 0$ , if  $M \in \mathcal{U}(\ell)$  satisfies  $r(M) \geq rg_{9.1}(a, b, c, \ell, t, s)$  and  $\varepsilon(M) > p(r(M))$ , then  $M$  has a minor  $N$  with  $\varepsilon(N) > p(r(N))$  and  $r(N) \geq t$  such that either*

- (1)  $N$  has a spanning-clique restriction, or
- (2)  $N$  is vertically  $s$ -connected and has an  $s$ -element independent set  $S$  so that  $\varepsilon(N) - \varepsilon(N/e) > p(r(N)) - p(r(N) - 1)$  for each  $e \in S$ .

**Theorem 9.2.** *There are functions  $sg_{9.2}: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  and  $rg_{9.2}: \mathbb{Z}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  so that, for all integers  $\ell \geq 2$ ,  $k \geq 1$ , and  $m \geq 3$ , if  $M$  is a vertically  $sg_{9.2}(k)$ -connected matroid with no  $U_{2,\ell+2}$ -minor and no Reid geometry minor, and with an  $M(K_{rg_{9.2}(\ell,m,k)+1})$ -minor and  $2k$  special points, then  $M$  has a simple*

minor  $N$  of rank at least  $m$  with an  $M(K_{r(N)+1})$ -restriction and  $k$  special points.

In order to apply Theorem 9.2, we need the following result of Geelen and Whittle [4].

**Theorem 9.3.** *There is a function  $\alpha_{9.3}: \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  so that, for all integers  $\ell, t \geq 2$ , if  $M \in \mathcal{U}(\ell)$  satisfies  $\varepsilon(M) > \alpha_{9.3}(\ell, t) \cdot r(M)$ , then  $M$  has an  $M(K_{t+1})$ -minor.*

We now prove a restatement of Theorem 1.3 and then Theorem 1.1.

**Theorem 9.4.** *There is a constant  $n_1$  so that if  $M$  is a simple matroid of rank at least  $n_1$  with no minor in  $\{U_{2,5}, F_7, R_9, U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}\}$ , then  $|M| \leq \binom{r(M)+2}{2} - 2$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be the class of matroids with no minor in  $\{U_{2,5}, F_7, R_9, U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}\}$ . Note that  $\binom{x+2}{2} - 2 = \frac{1}{2}x^2 + \frac{3}{2}x - 1$  for any positive number  $x$ . Let  $n_0$  be an integer so that  $\binom{x+2}{2} > \alpha_{9.3}(3, r_{9.2}(3, 6, 22)) \cdot x$  for all  $x \geq n_0$ . Define

$$n_1 = r_{9.1}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, -1, 3, n_0, \max(s_{9.2}(22), 44)\right).$$

Assume that there is a simple matroid  $M \in \mathcal{M}$  with  $r(M) \geq n_1$  and with  $|M| > \binom{r(M)+2}{2} - 2$ . By Theorem 9.1 with  $p(x) = \binom{x+2}{2} - 2$  and  $t = n_0$  and  $s = \max(s_{9.2}(22), 44)$ , there is a minor  $N$  of  $M$  so that  $r(N) \geq n_0$  and  $|N| > \binom{r(N)+2}{2} - 2$ , and either

- (a)  $N$  has a spanning-clique restriction, or
- (b)  $N$  is vertically  $s_{9.2}(22)$ -connected, and has a 44-element independent set  $S$  so that each  $e \in S$  satisfies  $\varepsilon(N) - \varepsilon(N/e) \geq r(N) + 2$ .

By Proposition 8.1(i), outcome (a) does not hold, so outcome (b) holds.

#### 9.4.1. Each element in $S$ is special.

*Proof.* For  $e \in S$ , let  $\mathcal{L}_N(e)$  denote the set of long lines of  $N$  that contain  $e$ . Then

$$(1) \quad \varepsilon(N) - \varepsilon(N/e) = 1 + \sum_{L \in \mathcal{L}_N(e)} (|L| - 2).$$

If  $e$  is on at least two 4-point lines of  $N$ , then  $e$  is special. If  $e$  is on no 4-point line of  $N$ , then, since  $\varepsilon(N) - \varepsilon(N/e) \geq r(N) + 2$ , it follows from (1) that  $|\mathcal{L}_N(e)| \geq r(N) + 1$ . Thus,  $|\text{si}(N/e)| \geq r(N) + 1$ . Since  $\text{si}(N/e)$  has rank  $r(N) - 1$ , this implies that  $\text{si}(N/e)$  has corank at least two, and so it contains at least two distinct circuits. Then  $e$  is a tip of two spike restrictions of  $N$ , and is thus special. If  $e$  is on exactly one 4-point line of  $N$ , then (1) implies that  $\text{si}(N/e)$  has corank at least one and thus contains a circuit, so  $e$  is a tip of a spike restriction of  $N$ .  $\square$

Since  $r(N) \geq n_0$  and  $|N| > \binom{r(N)+2}{2} - 2$ , Theorem 9.3 and the definition of  $n_0$  imply that  $N$  has an  $M(K_{r_9, 2(3,6,22)+1})$ -minor. Then, since  $N$  has no  $U_{2,5}$ - or  $R_9$ -minor, Theorem 9.2 implies that  $N$  has a simple minor of rank at least six with a spanning-clique restriction and at least 22 special points, which contradicts Proposition 8.1(ii).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.* Let  $n_1$  be the constant from Theorem 9.4, and let  $A$  be a 2-modular matrix of rank  $r \geq n_1$  with no zero-row and no parallel pair of rows. Let  $M$  be the vector matroid of  $A^T$ . Then  $M$  is a simple rank- $r$  matroid with no minor isomorphic to a matroid in  $\{U_{2,5}, F_7, R_9, U_{2,4} \oplus U_{2,4}\}$ . By Theorem 9.4,  $|M| \leq \binom{r(M)+2}{2} - 2$ , so  $A^T$  has at most  $\binom{r(M)+2}{2} - 2$  columns.  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] H. H. Crapo. Single-element extensions of matroids. *J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards Sect. B*, 69B: 55–65, 1965.
- [2] J. Geelen and P. Nelson. Matroids denser than a clique. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 114:51–69, 2015.
- [3] J. Geelen, P. Nelson, Z. Walsh. Excluding a line from  $\mathbb{C}$ -representable matroids. arXiv:2101.12000, submitted.
- [4] J. Geelen and G. Whittle. Cliques in dense  $\text{GF}(q)$ -representable matroids. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 87(2):264–269, 2003.
- [5] C. Glanzer, R. Weismantel, R. Zenklusen. On the number of distinct rows of a matrix with bounded subdeterminants. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 32:1706–1720, 2018.
- [6] I. Heller. On linear systems with integral valued solutions. *Pacific J. Math*, 7:1351–1364, 1957.
- [7] J. Oxley. *Matroid Theory*, Second Edition. Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- [8] J. Oxley, D. Vertigan, G. Whittle. On maximum-sized near-regular and  $\sqrt[6]{1}$ -matroids. *Graphs Combin.*, 14:163–179, 1998.
- [9] J. Paat, M. Schlöter, R. Weismantel. The integrality number of an integer program. *Math. Program.*, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-021-01651-0>.
- [10] W. T. Tutte. A homotopy theorem for matroids, I, II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 88, 144–174, 1958.

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA, USA

*Email address:* `oxley@math.lsu.edu`

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY, BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA, USA

*Email address:* `walsh@lsu.edu`